REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application, and in the Office Action, the Examiner rejected all of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) based on an alleged public use or sale. Specifically, the Examiner cited a product "WorkFlow" from Template Software, Inc. To show this alleged public use or sale, the Examiner relies on a set of documents "The Workflow Template." This set, in turn, includes two manuals: "Developing a WFT workflow System" ("System") and "Using the WFT Development Environment ("Environ").

In the Office Action, the Examiner also objected to the title of the application, but indicated that this objection can be held in abeyance until the time of allowance.

Applicants respectfully note that the cited Workflow Template documents do not show that the present invention was on sale or in public use more than one year before the filing date of this application. In particular, the mere presence of a document describing a product does not mean that the product itself was on sale or in public use. Applicants will, however, discuss the differences between the present invention and the disclosures of the two cited manuals.

Also, Applicants herein ask that independent Claims 1, 6 and 11 be amended to emphasize differences between the claims and the prior art.

For the reasons set forth below, Applicants believe that Claims 1-15, as presented herewith, patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. The Examiner is, thus, requested to enter this Amendment, to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-15, and to allow these claims.

7

The present invention, generally, relates to a method and system of providing an infrastructure for managing a process. The invention involves describing workflow types and coding subforms and data keywords for a defined workflow type, defining and customizing role documents, and building process flow documents for the defined workflow type. These features enable users to define, generate and deploy at a low cost, application defined workflows and their related components.

One important feature of this invention is the use of a central database, and in particular, the use of a set of databases templates in that database to build a set of documents for the workflow types. These documents include role documents, process flow documents and action control documents. As discussed in the present application, the use of these database templates in this way allows a workflow type to be customized without writing any code.

The manuals relied on by the Examiner to reject the claims do not disclose or suggest the use of these database templates in this way.

The cited manuals disclose a workflow management system (WFMS) in which event mechanisms or triggers manage the workflow through input and output containers. Data are moved, by event programs, between containers or across networks to other defined WFMS containers, where other event programs act on and process data as defined by some set of WFMS defined events. This requires complex systems to manage event activity.

With the present invention, the use of the database templates, as described above, enable application defined workflow pages and data to be easily and quickly managed and processed. It is not necessary, for example, to build and route forms or to map data and process models into

8

containers. In addition, it is not necessary to circulate control functions to perform querying, broadcasting or recovering of circulation materials.

Applicants herein request that independent Claims 1, 6 and 11 be amended to better describe the above-discussed differences between this invention and the prior art. Specifically, Claims 1 and 11 are being amended to describe expressly the feature that the database, which is already set forth in the claims, includes a set of database templates that, in turn, include defined features. These claims are also being amended to indicate expressly that this database is accessed to define and build the role documents, the process flow documents and the action control documents that are also already included in the claims. Analogous apparatus limitations are being added to Claim 6, which is directed to a system for providing a flexible infrastructure for managing a process.

In view of the above-discussed differences between the prior art and Claims 1, 6 and 11 and the advantages associated with those differences, it cannot be said that any of these claims is anticipated by or obvious in view of the prior art. Hence, these claims patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. Claims 2-5 are dependent from Claim 1 and are allowable therewith; and Claims 7-10 are dependent from, and are allowable with, Claim 6. Likewise, Claims 12-15 are dependent from Claim 11 and are allowable therewith.

The changes requested herein to Claims 1, 6 and 11 only emphasize differences between the claims and the prior art. It is thus believed that entry of this Amendment is appropriate, and such entry is respectfully requested.

9

Because of the reasons set forth above, the Examiner is requested to enter this

Amendment, to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. §102, and

to allow these claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants'

Attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is asked to telephone

the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

John S. Sensny
Registration No. 28,757
Attorney for Applicants

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

JSS:jy

10

G:\Ibm\1110\13997\AMEND\13997.am2.doc